

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 14 and 16 have been amended and claims 3, 5 and 15 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14 and 16 are now pending and submitted for reconsideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

A revised acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed July 13, 2004 is respectfully requested. On the initialed IDS form dated May 14, 2006, item B2 has been incorrectly changed. B2 should read JP 07081466, not EP 07081466. The reference is a Japanese patent application publication with an English language translation of the abstract from the European Patent Office. Correction and acknowledgment of the reference JP 07081466 is respectfully requested.

Objections

Claims 1 and 11 are objected to for various informalities. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended where appropriate and, therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 3 has been canceled and, therefore, the rejection is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/011810 (“Hiroaki”). The rejection should be withdrawn at least because Hiroaki fails to disclose, teach or suggest that “the perimeter of the enclosure is smaller than the perimeter of the airbag in an inflated condition” as called for in claim 1 and similarly in claim 14. Hiroaki discloses an airbelt 36 with a metal plate 44 surrounding a portion of the airbelt 36. *See* Hiroaki at ¶¶ [0163] and [0164]. The Office Action contends that the perimeter of the enclosure is smaller than that of the airbelt. *See* Office Action at p. 3. However, the perimeter of the metal plate 44 is clearly larger than the perimeter of the airbelt 36 in the inflated state. Fig. 10 of Hiroaki illustrates the airbelt 36 prior to inflation. In Fig. 11, the airbelt 36 is fully inflated and still the perimeter of the airbelt 36 is smaller

than the perimeter of the metal plate 44. Therefore, Hiroaki does not disclose, teach or suggest that “the perimeter of the enclosure is smaller than the perimeter of the airbag” as called for by claim 1 and similarly in claim 14 and, therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6-13 and 16 depend from claims 1 or 14 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art Fig. 4 (“AAPA”) in view of Hiroaki. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Hiroaki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,979,929 (“Stanger”). The rejections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

None of the references, taken together or separately, disclose, teach or suggest that “the perimeter of the enclosure is smaller than the perimeter of the airbag in an inflated condition” as called for by claim 1. The Office Action correctly states that AAPA does not disclose a bag enclosure. Furthermore, as stated above, Hiroaki does not teach a bag enclosure with a perimeter that is “smaller than the perimeter of the airbag in an inflated state.” Stanger fails to cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Hiroaki. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 4 and 6-13 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated,

otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

August 11, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5582
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Allen V. Linton, Reg. #28163

for Howard N. Shipley
Registration No. 39,370